

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/pm-22-30>

Reviewer A

Reply: First of all, I would like to thank you so much for taking the time to give me valuable feedback, this is the first time I am reviewing an article and I am learning a lot.

Comment 1: It's unclear who the search terms used by the author came up with 24 articles. When I searched these terms in PubMed, I received 259 articles.

Reply 1: I tried to collect articles which focused on management

Comment 2: Many parts of the manuscript state that the study explores "factors and variables that mediate management effectiveness in children with allergic rhinitis." However, Table 1 seems to show possible strategies and interventions. They do not appear to evaluate whether the interventions are effective.

Reply 2: I corrected the title and text and made changes that I wanted to show in the article

Comment 3: Most of the paper refers to mediators as variables that manage effectiveness, including the title. However, in the Discussion, the author states "mediators mentioned in the literature sources incorporated in this study include allergen avoidance, application of antihistamines...} [Line 87-89] It seems the author is now confusing mediators with the interventions/treatments. The author seems to confuse mediators and treatments throughout the manuscript.

Reply 3: I agreed it was confusing; I did changes in wording and corrected what I meant

Comment 4: [Line 130-] This manuscript states it identified factors and variables that impact the management choice in pediatric allergic rhinitis. However, the manuscript does not mention any factors. One would imagine that factors that impact management choice would include variables like age of patient (perhaps nasal steroids would be less likely chosen for young children), what triggers the patient's asthma (perhaps avoiding cats would be relatively easy if the patient were allergic to cats), whether the patient has asthma (perhaps children with asthma are more likely to have more aggressive treatment) etc.

Reply 4: I did change wordings that make sense

Comment 5: Usually, qualitative analyses have at least two reviewers who independently review the data and then agree on the themes. It seems that only one researcher conducted this analysis. Thus, this may not be considered a qualitative analysis. Perhaps, this would be considered a review paper.

Reply 5: I agreed to comment and will be glad if this article accepted as a review paper

Minor Comments

1. Consider mentioning the atopic march in lines 35-36. Allergic rhinitis is associated with atopic dermatitis and asthma.
2. [Line 37] Consider deleting “management” as it contradicts that there is minimal research on the management of allergic rhinitis [Line 42].
3. [Line 39] Is a comma needed after “triggers”? Otherwise, it is unclear what “triggers medications” are.
4. [Line 40] Consider deleting “research is detailed that” and starting with “while pediatric allergic rhinitis is diagnosed by the presence...”
5. [Line 42] Rather than “solid evidentiary foundation,” consider “solid evidence.”
6. [Line 49] Eliminate “The paper uses a qualitative research approach” because the paper does not use a qualitative research approach. Or consider, “The paper reports on a study that uses a qualitative research approach.”
7. [Line 51] It’s unclear what the author means by “provide data reach in meaning.” Is this supposed to be “provide data *rich* in meaning?”
8. [Line 57-58] Commas should be placed within quotation marks.
9. [Lines 59-60] More details of why the 16 studies were excluded would help. What does “methodological challenges” refer to?
10. [Line 60] Please clarify: “for not being current to respond to needs of the current research topic.”
11. [Lines 63-64] The paper reports that the researcher interpreted data “of interest to the researcher.” However, the manuscript does not define what is of interest to the researcher. The manuscript would be stronger if there were a clear objective defined in the manuscript.
12. [Line 72] Consider replacing “interesting and insightful” with more specific adjectives.
13. Line 74 states “Table 1” while Line 76 uses “Table One.” Please choose one.
14. [Line 78] The author states that the “findings reveal the most used interventions...” However, qualitative analyses are unable to quantify variables. It’s not possible to state that certain interventions are more used than others. The author may have found that one intervention was mentioned more often than another.
15. [Line 106] “Allergen” does not need to be capitalized.
16. [Lines 107-111] Please rephrase this sentence: “On their part, (3) note that ... to modify long-term disease outcomes.” The sentence does not appear to be grammatically correct.

Reply: All comments noted and corrected.

Reviewer B

Pediatric allergic rhinitis is indeed a very common condition influencing many children worldwide. Lots of children with allergic rhinitis develop asthma so

proper treatment of this condition is extremely important.

Unfortunately the article "Mediators of management effectiveness in pediatric allergic rhinitis" does not add to our knowledge of the condition.

The author chose some articles concerning ANN without providing any search criteria (type of articles, years etc). He found 24 articles in total which is really strange since using only the first of keywords in Pubmed only revealed 2424 articles published in the last 10 years.

The analysis he performed does not improve our knowledge of the disease and there is nothing in the article about the effectiveness of treatment that should be the main topic of the article

Reply: I really appreciated your time for reviewing my article, I did many changes in article so I would request to review again and please reconsider for publication as review paper. I did changes in wording that actually I meant and corrected.

As it was my first-time reviewing article I decided to go with most common topic.